

REMARKS

The Official Action dated 24 February 2004 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the first and second magnetic members as described in the specification with any structural detail.

Applicant respectfully submits that the first and second magnetic members (47, 48) have been shown in FIGS. 3-5 to be attached to the paddle wheels of the driving devices (45, 46) respectively, and have been described in page 10, lines 12-16. In addition, the originally filed claim 6 that includes the first and second magnetic members (47, 48) have been canceled, such that the first and second magnetic members (47, 48) are not required to be shown in further structural detail.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

In response, claim 6 has been cancelled, so that it is unnecessary to discuss the grounds of rejection specific thereto, and so that the drawings

are unnecessary to show further structural detail for the first and second magnetic members (47, 48).

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response, “the upper and the lower portions of the container” have been amended to --the upper container portion and the lower container portion respectively--; “the upper and the lower portions of the housing” have been amended to --the upper housing portion and the lower housing portion respectively--; and “the upper and the lower portions of the casing” have been amended to --the upper casing portion and the lower casing portion respectively--.

The term “close to” in claim 5 has been amended to --around--.

The fluids in the claims have been amended to --the first fluid, the second fluid, and the third fluid-- respectively.

Claims 1, 8-11; 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wasserman.

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 2-7 and 12 would be allowable if written to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and/or second paragraphs, as set forth in this Office Action, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims.

In response, claims 1-14 have also been amended or written to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and/or second paragraphs, as set forth in this Office Action.

Claim 2 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4.

Claim 6 has been cancelled.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 5.

Claims 8, 10 are dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 8. Claim 11 is dependent on claim 10.

Claim 12 which is indicated to be allowable has been written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 11. Claim 14 is dependent on claim 13.

Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, and 7-14 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner CIRIC are appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley
CHARLES E. BAXLEY
Attorney of Record
USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor
New York, N.Y. 10038
TEL: (212) 791-7200
FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.